arXiv:1211.3688v1 [gr-qc] 7 Nov 2012

Constraints on a recently postulated MOND effect in isolated aspherical systems in deep Newtonian regime from orbital motions

L. Iorio
Ministero dell'Istruzione, dell'Università e della Ricerca (M.I.U.R.)-Istruzione
Fellow of the Royal Astronomical Society (F.R.A.S.)
Viale Unità di Italia 68, 70125, Bari (BA), Italy

November 16, 2012

Abstract

Non-spherical systems described by MOND theories of modified gravity arising from generalizations of the Poisson equations are affected by a MONDian extra-quadrupolar potential $\phi_{\rm M}$ even if they are isolated and they are in deep Newtonian regime. In general MOND theories quickly approaching Newtonian dynamics for accelerations beyond A_0, $\phi_{\rm M}$ is proportional to a multiplicative scaling coefficient $\alpha \sim 1$, while in MOND models becoming Newtonian beyond $\kappa A_0,\ \kappa \gg 1$, it is enhanced by κ^2. We analytically work out some orbital effects due to $\phi_{\rm M}$ in the framework of QUMOND, and compare them with the latest observational determinations of Solar System's planetary dynamics, exoplanets and double lined spectroscopic binary stars. The current admissible range for the anomalous perihelion precession of Saturn yields $|\kappa| \leq 2.5 \times 10^5$, while the radial velocity of α Cen AB allows to infer $|\kappa| \leq 6.2 \times 10^4$ (A) and $|\kappa| \leq 4.2 \times 10^4$ (B). In evaluating such preliminary constraints it must be recalled that QUMOND is not the nonrelativistic limit of TeVeS.

1 Introduction

The MOdified Newtonian Dynamics (MOND) [1] is a theoretical framework proposed by Milgrom [2–4] to suitably modify the laws of the gravitational interaction in order to explain the observed kinematics of certain astrophysical extended systems such as various kinds of galaxies [5–7] and clusters of galaxies [8]. Indeed, their behaviour does not agree with the predictions made on the basis of the usual Newtonian inverse-square law applied to the electromagnetically detected baryonic matter whose quantity is insufficient to accommodate it. In almost[1] all its relativistic formulations, MOND implies a single acceleration scale [9] $A_0 = (1.2 \pm 0.27) \times 10^{-10}$ m s^{-2} at which the laws of gravitation would suffer notable modifications in order to explain the aforementioned discrepancy mimicking the effect of the additional non-baryonic Dark Matter which is invoked to explain the observed discrepancy [10] within the standard theoretical framework.

Basically, if $g_{\rm N}$ denotes the Newtonian acceleration within an isolated system of total mass $M_{\rm total}$, the modified acceleration g according to MOND is

$$g = \frac{g_{\rm N}}{\mu\left(q\right)},\ q \doteq \frac{g}{A_0}, \tag{1}$$

where $\mu(q)$ is an interpolating function such as

$$\mu(q) \rightarrow q \text{ for } q \ll 1 \text{ and } \mu(q) \rightarrow 1 \text{ for } q \gg 1. \tag{2}$$

Actually, the fact that

$$\frac{g}{g_{\rm N}} - 1 \rightarrow 0 \tag{3}$$

when

$$\mu - 1 \rightarrow 0 \tag{4}$$

for

$$q \rightarrow \infty \tag{5}$$

holds exactly only in some formulations of MOND, such as the "modified inertia" ones [11], and for systems whose matter density ρ is spherically symmetric. Instead, in formulations based on extensions of the Poisson equations, such as the nonlinear Poisson model by Bekenstein and Milgrom [12] and QUMOND [13], Milgrom [14] recently showed that $g/g_{\rm N} - 1$ remains finite in aspherical systems, no matter how $\mu - 1$ becomes small for high q. In other words, the dynamics of an isolated, non-spherical system of total mass $M_{\rm tot}$ and extension $R \ll d_{\rm M}$, where[2] the MOND radius is defined as

$$d_{\rm M} \doteq \sqrt{\frac{GM_{\rm tot}}{A_0}}, \tag{6}$$

is modified with respect to the Newtonian case even if it is in the deep Newtonian regime.

---

[1] See below for a discussion of this point.

[2] G is the Newtonian constant of gravitation.

More precisely, Milgrom [14] considered the case of an aspherical distribution of nonrelativistic masses having small extension with respect to $d_{\rm M}$ and whose temporal changes occur on timescales much longer than $t_{\rm M} \doteq d_{\rm M}/c$, where c is the speed of light in vacuum. By assuming $\mu = 1$ to the desired accuracy everywhere within the system, Milgrom [14], using QUMOND [13], which is the nonrelativistic limit of a certain formulation of bimetric MOND (BIMOND) [15], obtained a qudrupolar correction $\phi_{\rm M}$ to the Newtonian potential

$$\phi_{\rm M}(\mathbf{x}) = -\frac{\alpha G}{r_{\rm M}^5} x^i x^j Q_{ij}(\mathbf{x}) \tag{7}$$

with

$$Q_{ij}(\mathbf{x}) \doteq \frac{1}{2}\int \rho\left(\mathbf{x}^{'}\right)\left(x^{'2}\delta_{ij} - 3x_i^{'}x_j^{'}\right) d^3x^{'}; \tag{8}$$

$x^i, i = 1,2,3$ in eq. (7) are the components of the position vector $\mathbf{x} = \{x, y, z\}$ of a generic point P in the field with respect to the Center of Mass (CM) of the system, while $x_j^{'}, j = 1,2,3$ in eq. (8) determine the position of the system's mass elements with respect to the CM. The coefficient

$$\alpha = \frac{3}{4}\int_0^\infty w^{3/2}\left[\nu(w) - 1\right] dw > 0 \tag{9}$$

entering eq. (7) depends on a new interpolating function [14]

$$\nu\left(w\right),\ w \doteq \frac{g_{\rm N}}{A_0} \tag{10}$$

such as [14]

$$\nu(w) \rightarrow w^{-1/2} \text{ for } w \rightarrow 0 \text{ and } \nu(w) \rightarrow 1 \text{ for } w \rightarrow \infty; \tag{11}$$

$\nu(w)$ is related to the MOND interpolating function $\mu(q)$ by [14]

$$\nu\left[q\mu(q)\right] = \frac{1}{\mu(q)}. \tag{12}$$

Milgrom [14] quoted various possible values for α ranging from ≈ 0.075 to [1] ≈ 37. Milgrom [14] noticed that, in general, it is not necessary to have $\alpha \sim 1$. Indeed, in the original versions of TeVeS [16], A_0 is not the only characteristic constant appearing in them; in the nonrelativistic limit of such theories, the Newtonian regime is obtained in terms of a second, dimensionless constant[3] $\kappa \gg 1$ when $g_{\rm N} \sim A_0^* \doteq \kappa A_0$. Bekenstein and Magueijo [17] found $\kappa = 1.75 \times 10^5$, while Magueijo and Mozaffari [18] used $\kappa \gtrsim 1.6 \times 10^6$. According to Milgrom [14], the QUMOND versions of theories with $\kappa \gg 1$ require the use of an interpolating function

$$\nu(w) = 1 + \kappa^{-1/2}\left[\nu\left(\frac{w}{\kappa}\right) - 1\right]. \tag{13}$$

In this case,

$$\alpha_\kappa = \kappa^2 \alpha_{\kappa=1},\ \alpha_{\kappa=1} \sim 1. \tag{14}$$

However, the nonrelativistic limit of TeVes-like theories is not QUMOND [14]. Finally, we remark that Milgrom [14] felt that theories with $\kappa \gg 1$ cannot be considered as generic MOND results.

As stressed by Milgrom [14], the quadrupolar MOND effect of eq. (7) considered here has not to be confused with some other MONDian features occurring in strong acceleration regime previously examined in literature. In particular, it is not the quadrupolar effect [19, 20] due to the External Field Effect (EFE) [2,12,21] arising when the system under consideration is immersed in an external background field; indeed, here the system is considered isolated. Even so, residual MONDian effects in the strong acceleration regime exist, in general, because of the remaining departure of $\mu(q)$ from 1 when $q \gg 1$; their consequences on orbital motions of Solar System objects were treated in, e.g., [2,19,22,23]. Nonetheless, they are different from the presently studied effect, for which it was posed $\mu = 1$ to the desired accuracy. Finally, Milgrom [14] showed that the impact of the zero-gravity points [17,18,24] existing in high acceleration regions on the dynamics of the mass sources themselves is negligible with respect to the effect considered here.

The plan of the paper is as follows. In Section 2 we analytically work out some orbital effects caused by eq. (7), with eq. (14), in an isolated two-body system. In Section 3 our results are compared to latest observations on Solar System planetary motions, extrasolar planets, and spectroscopic binary stars. Section 4 is devoted to summarizing our findings.

2 Calculation of some orbital effects

In the case of a typical non-spherical system such as a localized binary made of two point masses M and m with $M_{\rm b} \doteq M_{\rm tot} = M + m$, its mass density

---

[3] It is so because the original versions of TeVeS are not compatible with general relativity: they do not reduce to it in the formal limit $A_0 \to 0$.

ρ can be posed

$$\rho\left(\mathbf{x}\right)=M\delta^{3}\left(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}_{M}\right)+m\delta^{3}\left(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}_{m}\right),\tag{15}$$

where $\mathbf{x}_m$ and $\mathbf{x}_M$ denote the position vectors of m and M with respect to the system's CM. By calculating eq. (8) with eq. (15), eq. (7) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_{\mathrm{M}}=-\frac{\alpha G\mu_{\mathrm{b}}}{2r_{\mathrm{M}}^{5}}&\left\{x_{M}^{2}y^{2}-2y_{m}^{2}y^{2}+4y_{M}y_{m}y^{2}-\right.\\&-2y_{M}^{2}y^{2}+x_{M}^{2}z^{2}+y_{m}^{2}z^{2}-2y_{M}y_{m}z^{2}+y_{M}^{2}z^{2}+x_{m}^{2}\left(y^{2}+z^{2}\right)-\\&-2x_{M}x_{m}\left(y^{2}+z^{2}\right)-6y_{m}yz_{m}z+6y_{M}yz_{m}z+z_{m}^{2}y^{2}-2z_{m}^{2}z^{2}+\\&+\left[\left(y_{M}-y_{m}\right)^{2}+\left(z_{M}-z_{m}\right)^{2}-2\left(x_{M}-x_{m}\right)^{2}\right]x^{2}-\\&-2\left(-3y_{m}yz+3y_{M}yz+z_{m}y^{2}-2z_{m}z^{2}\right)z_{M}+\left(y^{2}-2z^{2}\right)z_{M}^{2}+\\&\left.+6\left(x_{m}-x_{M}\right)\left[\left(y_{M}-y_{m}\right)y+\left(z_{M}-z_{m}\right)z\right]x\right\}.\end{aligned}\tag{16}$$

where $\mu_{\mathrm{b}}\doteq mMM_{\mathrm{b}}^{-1}$ is the binary's reduced mass. By taking the gradient of eq. (16) with respect to $\mathbf{x}$ it is possible to obtain the extra-acceleration $\boldsymbol{A}_P$ experienced by an unit mass at a generic point P in the field. The extra-accelerations $\boldsymbol{A}_m$ and $\boldsymbol{A}_M$ felt by m and M can be obtained by calculating $\boldsymbol{A}_P$ in $\mathbf{x}_m=MM_{\mathrm{b}}^{-1}\boldsymbol{r}$ and $\mathbf{x}_M=-mM_{\mathrm{b}}^{-1}\boldsymbol{r}$, respectively, where $\boldsymbol{r}=\{x_m-x_M,y_m-y_M,z_m-z_M\}$ is the relative position vector directed from M to m. We have

$$\boldsymbol{A}_{m}=-\frac{2\alpha A_{0}mM^{2}}{M_{\mathrm{b}}^{3}d_{\mathrm{M}}^{3}}r^{2}\boldsymbol{r},\tag{17}$$

$$\boldsymbol{A}_{M}=\frac{2\alpha A_{0}Mm^{2}}{M_{\mathrm{b}}^{3}d_{\mathrm{M}}^{3}}r^{2}\boldsymbol{r}.\tag{18}$$

It can be noticed from eq. (17)-eq. (18) that the extra-forces $\boldsymbol{F}_m,\boldsymbol{F}_M$ acting on both m and M are attractive, and their common intensity is

$$F=\frac{2\alpha A_{0}\mu_{\mathrm{b}}^{2}}{M_{\mathrm{b}}d_{\mathrm{M}}^{3}}r^{3},\tag{19}$$

in agreement with the result by Milgrom [14]. Finally, the relative extra-acceleration is

$$\boldsymbol{A} \doteq \boldsymbol{A}_m - \boldsymbol{A}_M = -\frac{2\alpha A_0}{d_{\rm M}^3}\left(\frac{\mu_{\rm b}}{M_{\rm b}}\right) r^2 \boldsymbol{r}. \tag{20}$$

For the following developments, it is useful to remark that, formally, eq. (20) can be derived from the effective potential

$$U_{\rm M} = \frac{\alpha A_0}{2d_{\rm M}^3}\left(\frac{\mu_{\rm b}}{M_{\rm b}}\right) r^4. \tag{21}$$

2.1 The pericenter precession

The longitude of pericenter $\varpi \doteq \mathit{\Omega}+\omega$ is a "broken" angle since the longitude of the ascending node $\mathit{\Omega}$ lies in the reference $\{x, y\}$ plane from the reference x direction to the line of the nodes[4], while the argument of pericenter ω reckons the position of the point of closest approach in the orbital plane with respect to the line of the nodes. The angle ϖ is usually adopted in Solar System studies to put constraints on putative modifications of standard Newtonian/Einsteinian dynamics [25]. Its Lagrange perturbation equation is [26]

$$\left\langle\frac{d\varpi}{dt}\right\rangle = -\frac{1}{n_{\rm b}a^2}\left[\left(\frac{\sqrt{1-e^2}}{e}\right)\frac{\partial\langle U_{\rm pert}\rangle}{\partial e} + \frac{\tan\left(\frac{I}{2}\right)}{\sqrt{1-e^2}}\frac{\partial\langle U_{\rm pert}\rangle}{\partial I}\right], \tag{22}$$

where $U_{\rm pert}$ is a small correction to the Newtonian potential; a is the relative semimajor axis, e is the orbital eccentricity, and I is the inclination of the orbital plane to the reference $\{x, y\}$ plane. The brackets $\langle\ldots\rangle$ in eq. (22) denote the average over one full orbital period $P_{\rm b} = 2\pi n_{\rm b}^{-1} = 2\pi\sqrt{a^3G^{-1}M_{\rm b}^{-1}}$. By adopting eq. (21) as perturbing potential $U_{\rm pert}$ in eq. (22), one gets

$$\left\langle\frac{d\varpi}{dt}\right\rangle = -\frac{5\alpha A_0 P_{\rm b}}{2\pi d_{\rm M}}\left(\frac{\mu_{\rm b}}{M_{\rm b}}\right)\left(\frac{a}{d_{\rm M}}\right)^2\sqrt{1-e^2}\left(1+\frac{3}{4}e^2\right). \tag{23}$$

As a cross-check of the validity of our result, we repeated the calculation of the long-term precession of ϖ by using eq. (20) as perturbing acceleration and the Gauss equations for the variations of the elements: we re-obtained eq. (23).

---

[4] It is the intersection of the orbital plane with the reference $\{x, y\}$ plane.

2.2 The timing in binary radipulsars

The basic observable in binary pulsar systems is the change τ_p in the time of arrivals (TOAs) of the pulsar p due to its generally unseen orbiting companion c. Its Keplerian expression is [27, 28]

$$\tau_\mathrm{p} = \mathrm{x_p}\left[(\cos E - e)\sin\omega + \sqrt{1-e^2}\sin E\cos\omega\right], \tag{24}$$

where E is the eccentric anomaly, and $\mathrm{x_p} \doteq a_\mathrm{p}\sin I/c$ is the projected semimajor axis of the the pulsar's barycentric orbit; if $m_\mathrm{p} \doteq M, m_\mathrm{c} \doteq m$, it is $a_\mathrm{p} = a_M = mM_\mathrm{b}^{-1}a$.

In general, the variation ΔY of an observable Y over a full orbital revolution can be computed as

$$\Delta Y = \int_0^{P_\mathrm{b}}\left(\frac{dY}{dt}\right)dt = \int_0^{2\pi}\left[\frac{\partial Y}{\partial E}\frac{dE}{d\mathcal{M}}\frac{d\mathcal{M}}{dt} + \sum_\psi \frac{\partial Y}{\partial\psi}\frac{d\psi}{dt}\right]\left(\frac{dt}{dE}\right)dE, \tag{25}$$

where $\mathcal{M}$ is the mean anomaly and ψ collectively denotes the other Keplerian orbital elements. The rates $\dot{\mathcal{M}}, \dot\psi$ entering eq. (25) are instantaneous, and are obtained by computing the right-hand-sides of, e.g., the Lagrange equations onto the unperturbed Keplerian ellipse without averaging them over P_b.

By using eq. (25), it turns out that the post-Keplerian time shift perturbation due to MOND is

$$\Delta\tau_\mathrm{p} = -\frac{7\alpha A_0 P_\mathrm{b}^2}{8\pi c}\left(\frac{m\mu_\mathrm{b}}{M_\mathrm{b}^2}\right)\left(\frac{a}{d_\mathrm{M}}\right)^3 e\sqrt{1-e^2}\left(1+\frac{e^2}{2}\right)\cos\omega\sin I. \tag{26}$$

2.3 The radial velocity

The radial velocity V_ρ [29] is a standard observable in spectroscopic studies of binaries [30]. Up to the radial velocity of the binary's center of mass V_0, the Keplerian expression of the radial velocity of the visible component of the binary reads

$$V_\rho = K\left[e\cos\omega + \cos(\omega+f)\right] = \frac{n_\mathrm{b}a_\mathrm{lc}\sin I}{\sqrt{1-e^2}}\left[e\cos\omega + \cos(\omega+f)\right], \tag{27}$$

where a_lc is the barycentric semimajor axis of the binary's component whose light curve is available; K is the semi-amplitude of the radial velocity. In the case of extrasolar planetary systems, it is usually the hosting star; thus, $a_\mathrm{lc} =$

$a_M = mM_{\mathrm{b}}^{-1}a$. In the case of spectroscopic binary stars, it may happen that the light curves of both the components (double lined spectroscopic binary stars) are available. The MOND-induced post-Keplerian perturbation of eq. (27) turns out to be

$$\Delta V_\rho = \frac{17}{2}\alpha A_0 P_{\mathrm{b}}\left(\frac{m\mu_{\mathrm{b}}}{M_{\mathrm{b}}^2}\right)\left(\frac{a}{d_{\mathrm{M}}}\right)^3 e\left(1+\frac{8}{17}e^2\right)\sin I\sin\omega. \tag{28}$$

3 Confrontation with the observations

3.1 Planets of the Solar System

As far as the Solar System is concerned, $t_{\mathrm{M}} = 39$ d; thus the quasi-staticity condition is fully satisfied by the gaseous giant planets for which it is $P_{\mathrm{b}} \gtrsim 4300$ d. Among them, Saturn, whose period amounts to $P_{\mathrm{b}} = 10759$ d, is the most suitable to effectively constrain α since its orbit is nowadays known with ≈ 20 m accuracy [25] thanks to the multi-year record of accurate radio-technical data from the Cassini spacecraft. In terms of its perihelion, its anomalous precession can nowadays be constrained down to sub-milliarcseconds per century (mas cty^{-1}) level, as shown by Table 1. If the case $\alpha_\kappa = \kappa^2\alpha_{\kappa=1}$, with $\alpha_{\kappa=1} \sim 1$ is considered, eq. (23) and Table 1

Table 1: Supplementary precessions $\Delta\dot{\Omega}, \Delta\dot{\varpi}$ of the longitudes of the node and of the perihelion for some planets of the Solar System estimated by Fienga et al. [25] with the INPOP10a ephemerides. Data from Messenger and Cassini were used. Fienga et al. [25] fully modeled all standard Newtonian/Einsteinian dynamics, apart from the solar Lense-Thirring effect which, however, is relevant only for Mercury. The reference $\{x, y\}$ plane is the mean Earth's equator at J2000.0. The units are milliarcseconds per century (mas cty^{-1}).

	$\Delta\dot{\Omega}$ (mas cty^{-1})	$\Delta\dot{\varpi}$ (mas cty^{-1})
Mercury	1.4 ± 1.8	0.4 ± 0.6
Venus	0.2 ± 1.5	0.2 ± 1.5
Earth	0.0 ± 0.9	-0.2 ± 0.9
Mars	-0.05 ± 0.13	-0.04 ± 0.15
Saturn	-0.1 ± 0.4	0.15 ± 0.65

yield

$$|\kappa| \leq 2.5 \times 10^5. \tag{29}$$

Our result supports the guess by Milgrom [14] that values of $\kappa > 10^5$ might be excluded. The outer planets (Uranus, Neptune, Pluto) are not yet suitable for such kind of analyses: indeed, their orbits are still poorly known because of a lack of extended records of radio-technical data. As far as their perihelia are concerned, their anomalous precessions are constrained to a $4 - 5$ arcseconds per century ($''$ cty^{-1}) level [31]. To be more precise, from eq. (23) for moderate eccentricities it turns out

$$\kappa \propto \frac{M_\mathrm{b}}{a^{7/4}} \left(\frac{\Delta\dot\varpi}{m}\right)^{1/2}. \tag{30}$$

In addition to Saturn ($m = 5.7 \times 10^{26}$ kg, $a = 9.5$ au), let us consider Pluto ($m = 1.3 \times 10^{22}$ kg, $a = 39.2$ au); Pitjeva [31] yields $\Delta\varpi = 2.84 \pm 4.51$ $''$ cty^{-1} for its anomalous perihelion precession. Thus,

$$\frac{\kappa_\mathrm{Pluto}}{\kappa_\mathrm{Saturn}} \sim \left(\frac{m_\mathrm{Saturn}}{m_\mathrm{Pluto}}\right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{a_\mathrm{Saturn}}{a_\mathrm{Pluto}}\right)^{7/4} \left(\frac{\Delta\dot\varpi_\mathrm{Pluto}}{\Delta\dot\varpi_\mathrm{Saturn}}\right)^{1/2} \sim 1460; \tag{31}$$

the constraint on κ from Pluto would be 1460 times less tight than eq. (29) inferred from Saturn. Although the orbit determination of Pluto will be improved by the ongoing New Horizons mission [32] to its system, its perihelion precession should be constrained down to a totally unrealistic 0.001 mas cty^{-1} level in order to yield constraints competitive with eq. (29). An analogous calculation for Neptune ($m = 1 \times 10^{26}$ kg, $a = 30.1$ au, $\Delta\dot\varpi = -4.44 \pm 5.40$ $''$ cty^{-1} [31]) yields $\kappa_\mathrm{Neptune} \sim 28\kappa_\mathrm{Saturn}$. It implies that the anomalous perihelion precession of Neptune should be improved down to a 0.1 mas cty^{-1} level. At present, no missions to the Neptunian system are scheduled. Nonetheless, the OSS (Outer Solar System) mission [33], aimed to test fundamental and planetary physics with Neptune, Triton and the Kuiper Belt, has been recently proposed; further studies are required to investigate the possibility that, as a potential by-product of OSS, the orbit determination of Neptune can reach the aforementioned demanding level of accuracy. The situation for Jupiter ($m = 1.898 \times 10^{27}$ kg, $a = 5.2$ au) is, in perspective, more promising. At present, its perihelion precession is modestly constrained at a -41 ± 42 mas cty^{-1} level [25]; thus it is currently not competitive with Saturn. A 0.1 mas cty^{-1} level would be required: such a goal may, perhaps, not be too unrealistic in view of the ongoing Juno mission [34], which should reach Jupiter in 2016 for a year-long scientific phase, and of the approved[5] JUICE mission [35], to be launched in 2022, whose expected lifetime in the Jovian system is 3.5 yr.

3.2 Radial velocities in binaries

In general, according to eq. (28), the most potentially promising binaries are necessarily those orbiting slowly enough to fulfil the quasi-staticity condition. Moreover, they should move in highly elliptical, non-face-on orbits, and their masses should be comparable. Finally, the data records should cover at least one full orbital revolution.

3.2.1 Exoplanets

The wealth of exoplanets discovered so far allows, at least in principle, to select some of them for our purposes.

Let us consider 55 Cnc d [36] which is a Jupiter-like planet ($m \sin I = 3.835 m_{\rm J}$) orbiting a Sun-like star ($M = 0.94 M_{\odot}$; $t_{\rm M} = 38$ d) along a moderately elliptic orbit ($e = 0.025$) with a period $P_{\rm b} = 14.28$ yr $= 5218$ d; the other relevant parameters are $\omega = 181.3^{\circ}, I = 53^{\circ}$. It was discovered spectroscopically; the accuracy in measuring the amplitude K of its radial velocity is [36]

$$\sigma_K = 1.8 \text{ m s}^{-1}. \tag{32}$$

By using eq. (28) for 55 Cnc d and eq. (32), it turns out

$$|\kappa| \leq 7 \times 10^{8}, \tag{33}$$

which is 3 orders of magnitude weaker than the constraint of eq. (29) inferred from the perihelion precession of Saturn. It should be noticed that the use of eq. (28), which refers to the shift of the radial velocity over one full orbital revolution, is fully justified since Fischer et al. [36] analyzed 18 years of Doppler shift measurements of 55 Cnc.

Other wide systems may yield better constraints, although not yet competitive with those from our Solar System. For example, HD 168443c [37] ($M = 0.995 M_{\odot}$, $m \sin I = 17.193 m_{\rm J}$, $t_{\rm M} = 39.8$ d, $P_{\rm b} = 4.79$ yr $= 1749.83$ d, $e = 0.2113$, $a = 2.8373$ au, $\omega = 64.87^{\circ}$, $\sigma_K = 0.68$ m s^{-1}) yields

$$|\kappa| \leq 3 \times 10^{7} \tag{34}$$

by assuming $I = 50^{\circ}$. Also in this case the use of eq. (28) is justified since the spectroscopic Doppler measurements cover more than one orbital period. A similar result may occur for 47 Uma d [38] ($M = 1.03M_{\odot}$, $m \sin I = 1.6m_{\rm J}$, $t_{\rm M} = 40$ d, $P_{\rm b} = 38.3$ yr $= 14002$ d, $e = 0.16$, $a = 11.6$ au, $\omega = 110^{\circ}$, $\sigma_K = 2.9$ m s^{-1}), but, in this case, the data used by Gregory et al. [38] span a period of just 21.6 years.

---

[5] `http://sci.esa.int/science-e/www/object/index.cfm?fobjectid=50321`

3.2.2 Spectroscopic stellar binaries

Looking at double lined spectroscopic binary stars, an interesting candidate is the α Cen AB system [39]. It is constituted by two Sun-like main sequence stars A ($M = 1.105M_{\odot}$) and B ($m = 0.934M_{\odot}$) revolving along a wide ($a = 23.52$ au) and eccentric ($e = 0.5179$) orbit with $P_{\rm b} = 79.91$ yr $=$ 29187.12 d $\gg t_{\rm M} = 56.35$ d. The standard deviations of their radial velocities are [39] $\sigma_{V_{\rho}^{(\rm A)}} = 7.6$ m s^{-1}, $\sigma_{V_{\rho}^{(\rm B)}} = 4.3$ m s^{-1}. Thus, from eq. (28) we obtain the tight constraints

$$|\kappa| \leq 6.2 \times 10^4 \ (\mathrm{A}), \tag{35}$$

$$|\kappa| \leq 4.2 \times 10^4 \ (\mathrm{B}). \tag{36}$$

Such bounds are one order of magnitude tighter than the one of eq. (29) inferred from the perihelion precession of Saturn.

Other aspects of MOND, different from the effect treated here, were investigated with Proxima Centauri[6] (α Cen C) [41–43].

3.3 Pulsars

In order to fruitfully use eq. (26), the orbital period of the binary chosen should be larger than $t_{\rm M} \approx 46.7$ d, obtained by using the standard value for the pulsar's mass $M = 1.4M_{\odot}$; this implies that wide orbits are required. Moreover, they should be rather eccentric as well, and the mass m of the companion should not be too small with respect to the pulsar's one. Finally, timing observations should cover at least one full orbital revolution. As a consequence, most of the currently known binaries hosting at least one radiopulsar are to be excluded because they are often tight systems with very short periods.

A partial exception is represented by the Earth-like planets [44] C ($P_{\rm b} =$ 66.5 d, $m = 0.0163m_{\rm J}$, $a = 0.36$ au, $e = 0.0186$, $I = 53^{\circ}$, $\omega = 250.4$) and D ($P_{\rm b} = 98.2$ d, $m = 0.0164m_{\rm J}$, $a = 0.46$ au, $e = 0.0252$, $I = 47^{\circ}$, $\omega = 108.3$)

---

[6] It should be gravitationally associated with α Cen AB [40]. Their mutual separation is 15,000 au [40].

discovered in 1991 around the PSR 1257+12 pulsar ($M = 1.4M_{\odot}$) [45]; the post-fit residuals for the TOAs was $\sigma_{\tau_{\rm p}} = 3.0\ \mu{\rm s}$ [44]. Applying eq. (26) to D yields

$$|\kappa| \leq 1.5 \times 10^{12}. \tag{37}$$

Such a constraints is far not competitive with those inferred from Saturn (Section 3.1) and α Cen AB (Section 3.2.2).

4 Summary and conclusions

We looked at the newly predicted quadrupolar MOND effect occurring in non-spherical, isolated and quasi-static $\left(P_{\rm b} \gg t_{\rm M} = \sqrt{GM_{\rm tot}A_0^{-1}c^{-2}}\right)$ systems in deep Newtonian regime, and calculated some orbital effects for a localized binary system in the framework of the QUMOND theory.

In particular, we worked out the secular precession of the pericenter, and the radial velocity and timing shifts per revolution. Our results are exact in the sense that no simplifying assumptions about the orbital geometry were used.

They all contain a multiplicative scaling parameter α which, in certain MOND theories encompassing another characteristic constant in addition to the usual MOND acceleration scale A_0, can be expressed as $\alpha_\kappa = \kappa^2\alpha_1$, with $\kappa \gg 1, \alpha_1 \sim 1$.

By using the latest orbital determinations of the planet of the Solar System, we inferred $|\kappa| \leq 2.5 \times 10^5$ from the supplementary precession of the perihelion of Saturn. The double lined spectroscopic binary α Cen AB allowed to obtain $|\kappa| \leq 6.2\times10^4$ (A), $|\kappa| \leq 4.2\times10^4$ (B) from our prediction for the shift in the radial velocity. The bounds that can be obtained by extrasolar planets, including also those orbiting pulsars, are not yet competitive. In general, the best candidates are binary systems made of comparable masses moving along accurately determined wide and highly eccentric orbits.

Our constraints are to be intended as somewhat preliminary because, strictly speaking, they did not come from a targeted analysis in which the MOND dynamics was explicitly modeled in processing the observations and a dedicated solve-for MOND parameter such as κ was determined along with the other ones. Nonetheless, they are useful as indicative of the potentiality offered by the systems considered, and may focus the attention just to them for more refined analyses. Moreover, in interpreting our constraints on κ, it must be recalled that they were obtained within the framework of

QUMOND, which is not the nonrelativistic limit of theories such as TeVeS predicting high values of κ.

References

[1] B. Famaey and S. S. McGaugh, "Modified newtonian dynamics (mond): Observational phenomenology and relativistic extensions," *Living Reviews in Relativity* **15** no. 10, (2012) . `http://www.livingreviews.org/lrr-2012-10`.

[2] M. Milgrom, "A modification of the Newtonian dynamics as a possible alternative to the hidden mass hypothesis," *The Astrophysical Journal* **270** (July, 1983) 365–370.

[3] M. Milgrom, "A modification of the Newtonian dynamics - Implications for galaxies," *The Astrophysical Journal* **270** (July, 1983) 371–389.

[4] M. Milgrom, "A Modification of the Newtonian Dynamics - Implications for Galaxy Systems," *The Astrophysical Journal* **270** (July, 1983) 384.

[5] V. C. Rubin, W. K. J. Ford, and N. . Thonnard, "Rotational properties of 21 SC galaxies with a large range of luminosities and radii, from NGC 4605 /R = 4kpc/ to UGC 2885 /R = 122 kpc/," *The Astrophysical Journal* **238** (June, 1980) 471–487.

[6] S. S. Vogt, M. Mateo, E. W. Olszewski, and M. J. Keane, "Internal kinematics of the Leo II dwarf spherodial galaxy," *The Astronomical Journal* **109** no. 1669, (Jan., 1995) 151–163.

[7] F. Walter, E. Brinks, W. J. G. de Blok, F. Bigiel, R. C. Kennicutt, Jr., M. D. Thornley, and A. Leroy, "THINGS: The H I Nearby Galaxy Survey," *The Astronomical Journal* **136** no. 6, (Dec., 2008) 2563–2647, `arXiv:0810.2125`.

[8] F. Zwicky, "Die Rotverschiebung von extragalaktischen Nebeln," *Helvetica Physica Acta* **6** (1933) 110–127.

[9] K. G. Begeman, A. H. Broeils, and R. H. Sanders, "Extended rotation curves of spiral galaxies - Dark haloes and modified dynamics,"

Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society **249** (Apr., 1991) 523–537.

[10] W. J. G. de Blok, F. Walter, E. Brinks, C. Trachternach, S.-H. Oh, and R. C. Kennicutt, Jr., "High-Resolution Rotation Curves and Galaxy Mass Models from THINGS," *The Astronomical Journal* **136** no. 6, (Dec., 2008) 2648–2719, `arXiv:0810.2100`.

[11] M. Milgrom, "MOND Particularly as Modified Inertia," *Acta Physica Polonica B* **42** no. 11, (Nov., 2011) 2175–2184, `arXiv:1111.1611 [astro-ph.CO]`.

[12] J. Bekenstein and M. Milgrom, "Does the missing mass problem signal the breakdown of Newtonian gravity?," *The Astrophysical Journal* **286** (Nov., 1984) 7–14.

[13] M. Milgrom, "Quasi-linear formulation of MOND," *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **403** no. 2, (Apr., 2010) 886–895, `arXiv:0911.5464 [astro-ph.CO]`.

[14] M. Milgrom, "A novel MOND effect in isolated high-acceleration systems," *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **426** no. 1, (Oct., 2012) 673–678, `arXiv:1205.1317 [astro-ph.CO]`.

[15] M. Milgrom, "Bimetric MOND gravity," *Physical Review D* **80** no. 12, (Dec., 2009) 123536, `arXiv:0912.0790 [gr-qc]`.

[16] J. D. Bekenstein, "Relativistic gravitation theory for the modified Newtonian dynamics paradigm," *Physical Review D* **70** no. 8, (Oct., 2004) 083509, `arXiv:astro-ph/0403694`.

[17] J. Bekenstein and J. Magueijo, "Modified Newtonian dynamics habitats within the solar system," *Physical Review D* **73** no. 10, (May, 2006) 103513, `arXiv:astro-ph/0602266`.

[18] J. Magueijo and A. Mozaffari, "Case for testing modified Newtonian dynamics using LISA pathfinder," *Physical Review D* **85** no. 4, (Feb., 2012) 043527, `arXiv:1107.1075 [astro-ph.CO]`.

[19] M. Milgrom, "MOND effects in the inner Solar system," *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **399** no. 1, (Oct., 2009) 474–486, `arXiv:0906.4817 [astro-ph.CO]`.

[20] L. Blanchet and J. Novak, "External field effect of modified Newtonian dynamics in the Solar system," *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **412** no. 4, (Apr., 2011) 2530–2542, `arXiv:1010.1349 [astro-ph.CO]`.

[21] M. Milgrom, "Solutions for the modified Newtonian dynamics field equation," *The Astrophysical Journal* **302** (Mar., 1986) 617–625.

[22] M. Sereno and P. Jetzer, "Dark matter versus modifications of the gravitational inverse-square law: results from planetary motion in the Solar system," *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **371** no. 2, (Sept., 2006) 626–632, `arXiv:astro-ph/0606197`.

[23] L. Iorio, "Constraining MOND with Solar System Dynamics," *Journal of Gravitational Physics* **2** no. 1, (Feb., 2008) 26–32, `arXiv:0711.2791 [gr-qc]`.

[24] P. Galianni, M. Feix, H. Zhao, and K. Horne, "Testing quasilinear modified Newtonian dynamics in the Solar System," *Physical Review D* **86** no. 4, (Aug., 2012) 044002, `arXiv:1111.6681 [astro-ph.EP]`.

[25] A. Fienga, J. Laskar, P. Kuchynka, H. Manche, G. Desvignes, M. Gastineau, I. Cognard, and G. Theureau, "The INPOP10a planetary ephemeris and its applications in fundamental physics," *Celestial Mechanics and Dynamical Astronomy* **111** no. 3, (Nov., 2011) 363–385, `arXiv:1108.5546 [astro-ph.EP]`.

[26] B. Bertotti, P. Farinella, and D. Vokrouhlický, *Physics of the Solar System*. Kluwer Academic Press, Dordrecht, 2003.

[27] T. Damour and G. Schäfer, "New tests of the strong equivalence principle using binary-pulsar data," *Physical Review Letters* **66** no. 20, (May, 1991) 2549–2552.

[28] M. Konacki, A. J. Maciejewski, and A. Wolszczan, "Improved Timing Formula for the PSR B1257+12 Planetary System," *The Astrophysical Journal* **544** no. 2, (Dec., 2000) 921–926, `arXiv:astro-ph/0007335`.

[29] D. Latham, "Radial velocities," in *Encyclopedia of Astronomy and Astrophysics*, P. Murdin, ed. Institute of Physics, November, 2000. Article number 1864.

[30] A. Batten, "Spectroscopic binary stars," in *Encyclopedia of Astronomy and Astrophysics*, P. Murdin, ed. Institute of Physics, November, 2000. Article number 1629.

[31] E. V. Pitjeva, "EPM ephemerides and relativity," in *IAU Symposium*, S. A. Klioner, P. K. Seidelmann, and M. H. Soffel, eds., vol. 261 of *IAU Symposium*, pp. 170–178. Jan., 2010.

[32] A. Stern and J. Spencer, "New Horizons: The First Reconnaissance Mission to Bodies in the Kuiper Belt," *Earth Moon and Planets* **92** no. 1, (June, 2003) 477–482.

[33] B. Christophe, L. J. Spilker, J. D. Anderson, N. André, S. W. Asmar, J. Aurnou, D. Banfield, A. Barucci, O. Bertolami, R. Bingham, P. Brown, B. Cecconi, J.-M. Courty, H. Dittus, L. N. Fletcher, B. Foulon, F. Francisco, P. J. S. Gil, K. H. Glassmeier, W. Grundy, C. Hansen, J. Helbert, R. Helled, H. Hussmann, B. Lamine, C. Lämmerzahl, L. Lamy, R. Lehoucq, B. Lenoir, A. Levy, G. Orton, J. Páramos, J. Poncy, F. Postberg, S. V. Progrebenko, K. R. Reh, S. Reynaud, C. Robert, E. Samain, J. Saur, K. M. Sayanagi, N. Schmitz, H. Selig, F. Sohl, T. R. Spilker, R. Srama, K. Stephan, P. Touboul, and P. Wolf, "OSS (Outer Solar System): a fundamental and planetary physics mission to Neptune, Triton and the Kuiper Belt," *Experimental Astronomy* **34** no. 2, (Oct., 2012) 203–242, `arXiv:1106.0132 [gr-qc]`.

[34] S. Matousek, "The Juno New Frontiers mission," *Acta Astronautica* **61** (Nov., 2007) 932–939.

[35] M. K. Dougherty, O. Grasset, E. Bunce, A. Coustenis, D. V. Titov, C. Erd, M. Blanc, A. J. Coates, A. Coradini, P. Drossart, L. Fletcher, H. Hussmann, R. Jaumann, N. Krupp, O. Prieto-Ballesteros, P. Tortora, F. Tosi, T. van Hoolst, and J.-P. Lebreton, "JUICE (JUpiter ICy moon Explorer): a European-led mission to the Jupiter system," in *EPSC-DPS Joint Meeting 2011*, p. 1343. Oct., 2011.

[36] D. A. Fischer, G. W. Marcy, R. P. Butler, S. S. Vogt, G. Laughlin, G. W. Henry, D. Abouav, K. M. G. Peek, J. T. Wright, J. A.

Johnson, C. McCarthy, and H. Isaacson, "Five Planets Orbiting 55 Cancri," *The Astrophysical Journal* **675** no. 1, (Mar., 2008) 790–801, `arXiv:0712.3917`.

[37] G. Pilyavsky, S. Mahadevan, S. R. Kane, A. W. Howard, D. R. Ciardi, C. de Pree, D. Dragomir, D. Fischer, G. W. Henry, E. L. N. Jensen, G. Laughlin, H. Marlowe, M. Rabus, K. von Braun, J. T. Wright, and X. X. Wang, "A Search for the Transit of HD 168443b: Improved Orbital Parameters and Photometry," *The Astrophysical Journal* **743** no. 2, (Dec., 2011) 162, `arXiv:1109.5166 [astro-ph.EP]`.

[38] P. C. Gregory and D. A. Fischer, "A Bayesian periodogram finds evidence for three planets in 47UrsaeMajoris," *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **403** no. 2, (Apr., 2010) 731–747, `arXiv:1003.5549 [astro-ph.EP]`.

[39] D. Pourbaix, D. Nidever, C. McCarthy, R. P. Butler, C. G. Tinney, G. W. Marcy, H. R. A. Jones, A. J. Penny, B. D. Carter, F. Bouchy, F. Pepe, J. B. Hearnshaw, J. Skuljan, D. Ramm, and D. Kent, "Constraining the difference in convective blueshift between the components of alpha Centauri with precise radial velocities," *Astronomy & Astrophysics* **386** (Apr., 2002) 280–285, `arXiv:astro-ph/0202400`.

[40] J. G. Wertheimer and G. Laughlin, "Are Proxima and α Centauri Gravitationally Bound?," *The Astronomical Journal* **132** no. 5, (Nov., 2006) 1995–1997, `arXiv:astro-ph/0607401`.

[41] M. Beech, "Proxima Centauri: a transitional modified Newtonian dynamics controlled orbital candidate?," *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **399** no. 1, (Oct., 2009) L21–L23.

[42] M. Beech, "The orbit of Proxima Centauri: a MOND versus standard Newtonian distinction," *Astrophysics and Space Science* **333** no. 2, (June, 2011) 419–426.

[43] V. V. Makarov, "Stability, chaos and entrapment of stars in very wide pairs," *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **421** no. 1, (Mar., 2012) L11–L13, `arXiv:1111.4485 [astro-ph.GA]`.

[44] M. Konacki and A. Wolszczan, "Masses and Orbital Inclinations of Planets in the PSR B1257+12 System," *The Astrophysical Journal Letters* **591** no. 2, (July, 2003) L147–L150, `arXiv:astro-ph/0305536`.

[45] A. Wolszczan, "Discovery of pulsar planets," *New Astronomy Reviews* **56** no. 1, (Jan., 2012) 2–8.